



NEW DIRECTIONS IN EDUCATION

LOYOLA EDUCATION CONFERENCE

FINAL REPORT

SPONSORED BY

THE LOYOLA OF MONTREAL STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

MONTREAL

November 11th and 12th, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Credits and Workshop Reporters	3
Thank You to Staff	4
Comments by Conference Chairman	5
Opening Session	7
Welcome Remarks	
Henri Lau	
Claude Charron, MNA	
Workshop Reports:	
Friday Evening:	
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	11
College Within at Tufts University	12
Goddard College	13
New College at Hofstra University	15
Mosaic, Dawson College	16
Saturday Morning:	
Quebec's CEGEPs	18
Student-Run Courses	20
Interdisciplinary Studies	21
Living and Learning, John Abbott College	22
Saturday Afternoon:	
Cooperative Education	24
Independent Study Programs	25
Alternative Educational Structures--	26
Institutional Initiatives	
Report on Closing Session	28
Conference in Retrospect	30
Conference Executive	31
List of Invited Guests	32

CREDITS AND WORKSHOP REPORTERS

Cover Design	Margit Boronkay
Opening Session	Terry Walsh Margit Boronkay
Worcester Polytechnic	Alain Godbout
College Within, Tufts	David Levine and Dorothy Nixon
Goddard College	Andrée Lea, Andy Lester and Pat Allison
New College, Hofstra	Philippe Chagnon and Don Bunis
Mosaic, Dawson College	Terry Walsh
Québec's CEGEPs	Gerry Gross
Interdisciplinary Studies	Terry Walsh
Independent Study	Terry Walsh
Living and Learning	Andrée Lea
Cooperative Education	Alain Godbout
Closing Session	Eric Novick
Final Report Editor	Bruce Shore

In the undertaking of a conference such as this, there are many people who work hard to see it happen, but never receive the public credit they are due. I'd like to extend my thanks to the following people, without whose help, the conference would not have come about. Also, a special thanks to Bruce Shore, the chairman of the conference.

Pat Allison
 Gloria Baldwin
 Bob Boire
 Don Bunis
 Gloria Cerviac
 Phil Chagnon
 Ross Cullen
 Alain Godbout
 Marcel Heyligen
 Tina Horne
 Andrée Lea
 Andy Lester
 Dave Levine
 Mary Malone
 Dorothy Nixon
 Barb Simpson
 Terry Walsh

THANKS!

Sincerely,

Eric Novick
 Conference Coordinator

Comments by the Conference Chairman

This was a remarkable conference in two important ways. First, it was organized by the Students Association for the faculty and students of Loyola of Montreal. Second, a lot of learning occurred. This combination is the best assurance that the organizers of this conference were right in their belief that students themselves have much to contribute to learning in an institution of higher education. A very conventional model was chosen for this conference, guest speakers, questions, and discussion groups. This was, however, an excellent choice. It worked.

From time to time students are willing to play "our game" according to "our rules." One of the disappointments of this conference was that few professors were willing to join in. Those that came and their many student colleagues will have considerable reason to be grateful to Eric Novick and his colleagues. The observation that innovation goes on all around, and to talk further is to stagnate (see Conference in Retrospect) contains an element of truth. It has to be tempered by the realization that if Loyola--or any university--does have, and wishes to retain, a unique identity, then the directions for innovation that it can follow will also tend to be unique. Direct borrowing is rarely, if ever, possible. The examples put on display at this conference did, however, present some fascinating models. It is good that we are attracted to exciting things from far away. The greatest care must be taken, nevertheless, to use this fascination as an impetus to create one's own solutions, not to seek to emulate.

Another general point which was repeated by many participants in this conference, and which was a major focus of the conference, is that these innovations are examples. They are alternatives, not to be examined for any single solution to educational problems. The value of a conference such as this is that it places together alternatives that can be viewed at once, and gives educational planners and dreamers the opportunity to think about the simultaneous offering of many alternatives. Only the smallest colleges represented could do anything unusual uniformly, and only at great costs. Larger institutions face the challenge of learning to encourage internal diversity as a matter of priority policy, rather than the more common preservation of an imaginary unity or conformity.

The chairman of any conference of this type suffers the reverse of the plight of the volunteer workers: Considerable glory and not too much work. To all my friends at Loyola, thank you for the privilege of letting me learn with you.

Bruce M. Shore
Faculty of Education and
Centre for Learning and
Development
McGill University

OPENING SESSION

The conference began with a welcome by the Conference Coordinator. His remarks stressed the importance of involving students actively in the search for new directions in higher education. This conference was intended to be one of several means to that goal.

Presentation: International Setting for
New Directions in Education

Speaker: Professor Henri Lau
Loyola of Montreal, Department of
Philosophy

In his address Professor Lau quoted from Jessup:

"What lovers of paradox we are! Youth studies but can not act; the adult must act but has no opportunity of study; and we accept the divorce complacently. . . we behave like people who should try to give their children in a week all the food they require for a year; a method which might seem to save time and trouble, but would not improve digestion or health."

He pointed out the ironical effect of formal education inhibiting learning, reminding his listeners that the infant and child learn quantitatively more in the first five years of their life than during the rest of their life.

In response to the divorce of study from action and of the inhibiting nature of formal education, Professor Lau urged his listeners to consider education a really integral part of life. "And if learning is an integral part of our lives it ought to be continuous; as life goes on, learning goes on." He then outlined the principles of a long term strategy for remodeling the educational system, based on distributing education over the lifespan of the individual. The goal would be to replace the traditional rigid succession of childhood, education, work, and retirement with a more flexible system involving alternating between at least the last three parts of the life cycle. Such an approach, he suggested, would respond more adequately than the existing system to "the demands of an increasingly rapidly changing society and to the increasing quest for a free determination of one's own way and style of life."

He added that this concept of "Recurring Education" is receiving special attention on a world-wide basis from the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. Professor Lau concluded his remarks by wishing the Conference participants a creative two days, and by expressing the hope that the Conference would contribute to the making of learning "the most exciting activity of our lives."

Presentation: The Role of Government in Education

Speaker: Claude Charron, MNA
Parti Québécois Member for St.-Jacques
(Montreal)

Mr. Charron spoke to the audience, responded to questions from a panel of Loyola faculty members, and then answered questions from the floor. He began his remarks with the assertion that the existence of a role for government in education was not an issue, only the nature of this role and its extent remain to be discussed. The delicate balance between the rights of individuals and the society as a whole was important at several levels in his presentation. Following are selections from several parts of his presentation:

The university exists, not for the exceptional individuals who wish to pursue individualistic aims, but for the raising of the level of the mass of society. If the government is interested in the good of the society, and it allocates funds to support the universities, allowing the latter total freedom in determining what will happen in the university, the result will be "freedom and happiness for the universities," simultaneous with the deterioration in the quality of that particular society. The Parti Québécois is opposed on very fundamental issues to the Liberal Party, and the role of the universities is one aspect of the opposition. Basically what is involved is a different view of the nature of man. The typical liberal opinion is that man is, lives and becomes truly himself primarily as an individual. From this extreme interpretation of the 19th Century Bill of Human Rights, a laissez-faire capitalist attitude results. Specifically in terms of the universities, this means, for example, that if 2000 students should happen to apply to Loyola all of whom wish to study history, it would be theoretically possible for them to do so. The Parti Québécois would consider this an extravagant waste of government funds. These funds originate in the pockets of the people, but when a typical graduate of such an education enters the

society which provided the means of his bettering himself, he often does not give back to the society in a new, different, and much-needed way. Thus, the government should gear the universities and colleges towards educating people in a socially-beneficial way. This is the meaning of planning, the society-oriented direction and control exercised by the "few" who are elected to do a certain amount of deciding as to where the society should be going, and how it is to get there. Rather than regret this restriction on total freedom of the individual, we should come to realize the socialist belief that the individual is realized through his relationship to society, rather than as a sole entity. It is therefore in the interests of both the society and the individual, that education be geared towards the development of the society in which that particular individual finds himself.

It is precisely because the Quebec society has not yet arrived at a position of autonomy that there needs to be a certain amount of control on the members of its society. If total freedom were allowed, many French-speaking families would send their children to English schools, as they were doing before the Quiet Revolution. In this way the French culture would have been almost totally absorbed into the English North-American melting-pot. It is for this reason of survival that the first of Quebec's binary goal, is of such urgency - the preservation of the French Quebec reality. This goal is to be achieved primarily by making French the only official language. The Parti Québécois leaders consider that a ten-year period of such incubation is necessary to provide the supports necessary to have a strong inner security in the province, and to build the self-respect so blatantly lacking in the typical Québécois "qui est un homme amoindris, peureux, poigné, colonisé, appauvris." This installation of French as the official language would operate in the following sectors: municipal authorities, school commissions, advertising, and "la vie sociale." Thus, although Westmount, for example would operate officially in French, this would not take away the rights of the citizens living in this municipality, for whom provision would be made as a respected anglophone minority, for communication in English with their municipal authorities. The Parti Québécois does not want to treat the anglophone minority with the same arrogant disregard of cultural realities that the French received at the hands of the colonialist English. Quebec's second need is development. This is the true goal, to be able to stand up as a self-respecting nation and to join the conference of nations, knowing that it enters global negotiations on peace and war as a true entity, participating authentically in the larger societal framework. For these goals to be realized it is

essential that the people place their confidence in their elected representatives. This is the "leap of faith" which must be made in any kind of relationship, in this case between the people and the government. There is the question of confidence which is the fundamental question of politics. If you give power to a group there is always the possibility of their mis-using it.

But this is the step that the Québécois are asked to make, in their own interest to place their confidence in those few who can see ahead further and more clearly than the mass of the people, still suffering from the stultifying effects of having been denied the opportunity to realize themselves as a society, distinct from but participating in the North-American context.

WORKSHOP REPORTS

FRIDAY EVENING

Topic: Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Presenter: J.J. Miliensky, Projects Administrator
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

The transformation of Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) began ten years ago with a small gathering of students and professors meeting weekly to talk about education. After five years, a planning group was formed to assess the potential of the developing an array of innovations called the WPI Plan. An official report was made on this proposal in 1970 and in a vote by the Worcester faculty, it was decided to convert over to the new program. The program, described below, is now being implemented.

The goals of the WPI Plan are quite explicit: to give students the opportunity to learn how to learn, and to demonstrate or to translate this into action. To achieve this, a vast range of innovations is being implemented:

(1) The degree is no longer granted on the basis of accumulated credits, but on a problem-solving competency exam in the students major area. This completes the experience of interdisciplinary team projects related to the students major area, relating his major to a human value-complex situation, and competency in one of the humanities. There is a great stress on the interdisciplinary aspect of these projects; students in various areas work together on a project.

(2) The administrative support structures have undergone great revisions. The academic year is now divided into five, seven week terms. This is to give increased flexibility to the student's plan of studies. The short term enables students to leave campus easily for the project stages with industry, government agencies, and on the growing number of off-campus internship centres. An intersession period of three weeks in January gives students and professors an opportunity to get together in interest groups to explore problems and themes. The intersession has given inter-disciplinary study a dynamic nature at WPI, with an extensive variety of imaginative mini-courses. Some courses are organized on an individually prescribed basis, with students proceeding through units of study at their own pace.

The guidance program is a critical aspect of WPI Plan. The student plans his own studies with the individual attention of a WPI professor. The program has had the visible effect of increasing students self-reliance and self-confidence.

Topic: College Within, Tufts University

Presenters: Jon Addelson, Cathy Grove, and John Katz
Graduate Student Mentors

"One of the basic premises of the College Within is to offer a student the opportunity to become a more responsible agent for his own education. For this purpose, the College Within is organized into "modules": groups of approximately 16 undergraduates working together with a "mentor team" consisting of a faculty member and two graduate student apprentice-mentors."

"The emphasis of the College Within is triadic, that is, the three major areas of learning--humanities, social sciences, natural sciences--are represented in each mentor team. As currently constituted, the College Within program consists of six modules, each working closely within itself and all modules working together."

"In lieu of courses, each student formulates, pursues, and completes a series of self-initiated projects. Flexible guidelines for these are set forth in a "contract" consisting of a written proposal indicating the nature and rationale of the study, an assessment of the resources required, and an indication of the time deemed necessary to complete the study."

"After the details of a contract have been worked out between the student and his mentors, the latter aid the student throughout his project by offering their own expertise, citing other resources, contacting individuals expert in the student's field of interest, and by providing him with feedback."

"The College Within student is responsible for his own education and will thus organize his work in accordance with what he is studying and with how he studies best. His flexible schedule will help him to discover those

rhythms of learning most appropriate to his intellectual development. Essentially he is learning to learn."

"The College Within does not run on the traditional semester basis. The calendar differs according to the parameters of each student's project. It is expected that a student will remain in the College Within for at least one year to benefit fully from the program. Participation at the present time is limited to two years. In addition, students may elect to audit or formally register for courses as supplements to their projects. In as much as the College Within provides an opportunity to study one subject intensely, the number of courses a student may take while doing College Within work is generally limited to one."*

There seems to be a consensus that the program produces emotional strain, since individual study does isolate the student. To counteract this, opportunities for communication between participants are encouraged. There also seems to be a maturing effect. Some students have suspended their studies after completing the program in order to think carefully about their futures.

As would be expected, there is some conflict with traditional departments and even between modules concerning grading. College Within does, nevertheless, provide an environment for many students to do superior work of a type not found elsewhere in the university community while maintaining a commitment to both scholarship and mutual support.

Topic: Goddard College

Presenter: Dan Anderson
Member of Educational Council

Five hundred students are now enrolled at Goddard. The criterion for acceptance of a potential student is a personal interview. In this interview the person's ability to survive and thrive at Goddard are discussed. The person must also have some self-awareness, but the final judgment is left to the student. If the student wants to stay, he must discuss

*from the College Within brochure.

his future program with a faculty counsellor. For the first few weeks the student works closely with this counsellor. A three-year program is required for a B.A. Student, however, are usually expected to take a vacation after three semesters. Two of the nine semesters must be spent working off campus, in the community. This is due to the fact that Goddard is isolated from the community. Learning is not only accomplished through the courses, but also in community living. The dorms are coeducational and most of them contain cooking facilities. Many times, a family type of living emerges.

Goddard also has a graduate school from which an M.A. can be obtained. They currently have a two year Para-Medical program which trains people to go into Para-Medical schools.

There are 55 faculty members at Goddard. Faculty can teach in the manner in which they feel is most worthwhile. They have to give an outline of the courses which they want to teach before the beginning of the year. Classes are very small, going from the independent studies which is on a one to one basis, to classes up to twelve to one. The criteria for marking are the students' evaluations of the course and what they learned, and the teachers' evaluation of what the students felt. The traditional marking scheme of A, B, C etc. is not employed.

Relations between the faculty and students are fairly good. Everyone is on a first name basis and some closeness develops. The students have much power in the decision-making of the college, but it all comes down to their willingness to use it. After schooling at Goddard, some students go into the teaching profession, 30 to 40% go on to graduate school and a negligible number go into business.

Goddard is very expensive. Each student must pay \$4,600 per year. Twelve per cent of the budget, however, is given for financial aid (i.e. for students who are unable to afford it). Goddard does not accept any money from the government because it feels it would act against the principle of academic freedom.

Don Anderson ended the workshop by stating that while he can give an image of Goddard College, one must actually be there to fully understand its experimental program.

Topic: New College, Hofstra University

Presenters: David Christman, Dean, and John Kinsel,
Assistant Dean

In 1935 Hofstra became a subdivision of New York University. It was founded and took its place of residence in an old estate which was willed to N.Y.U. In its formative stages it was small but after World War II it began to grow and is still growing. In 1958, for example, there were 8,000 students registered, it has now over 12,000. Ten years ago it became a major university. In 1964-65 it received its own university charter. At this time an alternate undergraduate system was founded: this being the NEW COLLEGE at Hofstra in 1967-68. It began as a very small institution and grew to its present day enrolment of just over 400 students. The New College started basically as an extension of a Freshmen year. It was only a one year program which was later expanded to its present day 3 year program. This institution is a degree granting structure inside the University. The basic premise of the institution is that it is an innovative liberal arts school.

The history of the curriculum was a turbulent one. The program of studies started as a rather narrow and restrictive process in which students were placed in separate programs. However, this over the years has been replaced with an innovative program which allows students to diverge as broadly as they wish. Various ideas, such as, work-study programs and independent study areas have been adopted. Furthermore, the curriculum is based on the semester system which allows for greater freedom of choice. A student needs 120 credits to graduate, each course giving 3-4 credits. The broad base of the institution's curricula are best exemplified by its Student Initiatives Projects where students sign a contract for each of their independent projects. The student then fills his needs to the best of his ability and gets it evaluated. The contract is basically a safe-guard for both faculty and students in that it allows the student to alter the course of his project, and also allows faculty to be exempt from unforeseen implications in the project.

The curriculum is not unrestrictive in that a student is advised to take a certain amount of course in his discipline. The students are given a clear mandate to help both in governing the institution and also aid in the educational reform which is constantly occurring. The former is shown by the

fact that students have parity on their committees and are placed quite highly in the administrative aspects of the New College. The latter allows students to say what they feel about the institution, the courses, the innovations, and so on in the form of "Bitching Sheets" which are circulated to the students throughout the year.

The faculty is composed of 18 members who are being exchanged constantly. The small faculty may seem to be a disadvantage, however the much larger faculty at Hofstra can and is being tapped of its resources. This leads the way for independent research for students. The students can in fact have a specialist in their field of interest in almost every case. Another valuable role faculty present is that of advisor to the student. Such ideas as Team Teaching are used widely and with great success.

There is no doubt that Hofstra has put it all together, however, there are problems. The fact that they are running on a very tight budget is just one detriment. The fact that students pay on the average \$2,300 tuition annually plus expenses, and residence is also a problem. However, New College represents an alternative to both the old way of learning and the new "change the world" concept. It is an alternative which is well worthwhile as well as being a valid alternative in Education in our present everyday context. The institution does not succumb to Mark Twain's quote, "Don't let your education interfere with your learning."

Topic: MOSAIC, Dawson College

Presenter: Michael Harris, Coordinator

Mosaic has been one of Dawson College's most controversial programs. It offers Cegep students the opportunity to spend up to three-fifths of their collegial studies with a collective of some one hundred fellow students, three full time faculty, and all the resource people that can be found. Mosaic has the use of a large work area which includes workshops, a lounge, offices and lockers. The program is developed by the collective: interest groups form, seminars and workshops are arranged, individual and group projects are developed with the help of tutors. The students and resource people teach and learn from each other, and strive for a sense of community.

The workshop was concerned mostly with the education of the participants in terms of the possibilities of such an approach. During the workshop most of the noteworthy aspects of Mosaic were discussed. Students who were present at the seminar gave credibility as to the effectiveness of its approach to education in the wholistic sense. They talked of how the living and learning process became one. In the course of the discussion it was shown how the experience of learning was expended in an atmosphere of informal structure and non-competitiveness. As a result of the lack of competition among those in the programme, there developed a sense of responsibility and respect for others. It was also stated that the learning one experienced in the Mosaic workshops was not solely academic, and as a result, students gained a knowledge of themselves that they thought would not have been possible in another environment.

Michael Harris stated that it was necessary in some instances to bend the structures of the institution. Some representatives of the existing structures at times have to be kept ignorant of some details of the program in order to avoid presumptive rejection of many of the unconventional methods being used. Most controversial of these methods was the responsibility given to the student in creation of their learning experiences. Each workshop of the Mosaic program handles all administrative functions. For instance, each workshop decides on hiring and firing, budget and curriculum. Also, students take part in the other side of administrative procedures, for example, all maintenance. The Mosaic program was revealed as an effective approach to education in that it placed responsibility on the shoulders of the students, giving one first a sense of community, and, as a consequence, of individual growth.

SATURDAY MORNING

Topic: Québec's CEGEPs

Presenters: Joe Burke, Loyola of Montreal
Reginald Edwards, McGill University
Gerry Gross, Loyola of Montreal
Michael Harris, Dawson College (CEGEP)

(Explanatory Note: CEGEP is an acronym for Collège d'Enseignement Général et Professionnel, roughly translated as Vocational and General Education Colleges. CEGEPs are Quebec's new and unique intermediate step between high school, ending after 11 grades, and work or university. Programs last one to three years. Pre-university programs last two years, and are followed by three-year Bachelor's programs.)

The discussion in this meeting was wide-ranging, but it is possible to identify certain specific themes which ran through the entire meeting. The meeting began by a discussion of the development of the CEGEP. Most of the remarks were those of Professor Edwards. Prof. Edwards, having studied carefully the development of the CEGEP in the context of the political and social history of the Province of Quebec, presented a rather detailed view of the forces that account for the present character of the CEGEP. He considered the views of the members of the Parent Commission, their views of the model provided by the junior college network in California, the viewpoint of each of the members of the commission toward the then existing network of Collèges Classique, and he concluded by providing a fairly solid historical perspective on the development of the CEGEP.

Quite naturally the discussion evolved from the historical perspective to a general consideration of the present constitution of the CEGEP program, of the attitudes which prevail regarding the balance between specialization and general studies, as well as the balance between the academic and professional programs. But most of the interest of those attending the meeting was pretty clearly centred on educational innovation in the CEGEP, and the discussion for the remainder of the meeting centred on that point.

Michael Harris, who has been teaching in the Mosaic program at Dawson College, provided considerable information for the discussion of the "college within" idea. Since several of those attending had been present the evening before at the discussion of the College Within at Tufts, this meeting provided a further opportunity for them to express their views and to compare the Dawson experience with Mosaic to the general idea of the "college within." The conclusion of most of those present seems to be that the "college within" offers an alternative structure rather than a point toward which the CEGEP as a whole should evolve. There seemed to be a good deal of support for a kind of pluralistic variety of academic opportunities including independent study programs, modular courses, the development of the college within and combinations of these ideas such as those found in the Worcester Polytechnical Institute where a variety of modes of study are available side by side with traditional courses.

One of the interesting points made by Michael Harris was that Mosaic has become a department at Dawson mainly because of the administrative requirements of that program. Other participants voiced the opinion that the very concept of departments inhibits useful change because it creates rigid structures which are difficult to alter. Brendan Cavanaugh reminded the meeting of a study done at the University of Minnesota which suggests that innovative educational programs have a useful lifespan of about eight years, and that those involved in that study had suggested that administrative structures ought to provide for the phasing in of new programs within temporary structures as well as for the phasing out of the program and the structure along with it.

While there was not enough time to come to any concrete conclusions, generally speaking, the participants seemed to agree on several important points. Most important is probably the idea that a student ought to be able to find programs that suit his needs rather precisely; that is to say, he should be able to negotiate entrance to the program at the level at which he needs to begin to learn. Secondly, the experiential aspect of education is not getting the kind of attention it needs and certainly never has in the past. In order to begin to answer to that need, a variety of choices in modes of education, as well as in the content of courses, ought to be available to a student body. And in order to accommodate that kind of variety, the administrative structure of a CEGEP has to be flexible and encourage diversity in methodology. Third, the CEGEP was not created as an expression of the "felt need" of a community. As a kind of product of the wider history of the province rather than the particular experience of the Anglophone sector, the CEGEP is having some difficulty in getting to know itself.

Topic: Student-Run Courses

Presenter: Bruce Shore, McGill University

Discussion was focussed on a unique student-run course, The Student as Decision-Maker, given by the Loyola of Montreal Students Association. Alain Godbout, coordinator of the course and Educational Vice-President of the LSA, and Froma Saxe, a student registered in the course, assisted in the discussion.

The Student as Decision-Maker grew out of the LSA executive's election platform of educational reform. It, and the present conference, are two of the many ideas resulting from this platform. The LSA obtained the approval of the Senate to grant full course credit for their undertaking, and full responsibility for the course.

It is unique in several ways. First, the students obtained complete responsibility for the undertaking, including the grading. Student-run courses are not extremely rare, but ultimate grading responsibilities usually remain with a professor. Grading, as anticipated, has become a problem, with evaluation in general. This probably reflects the students' commendable reluctance to make the arbitrary decisions which are often a part of evaluation, as well as the great difficulty of measuring the course's goals (to be discussed below). A second unique feature is the process by which the course was set up. The students simply submitted a new course proposal through normal channels, with the help of sympathetic Senators, faculty and students. The largest number of student-run courses is found in "free universities" outside the regular university. The Student as Decision-Maker is another bit of evidence that a university--or, more properly, multi-university--can support fairly radical alternatives within its structure. At least small ones!

The course is about students. Its aim is to give students an opportunity to learn about themselves as members of a community, as participants in a learning experience. Eight units or modules, of which students select four, examine topics from high school to the internal politics of an institution of higher learning. Instructors are students and volunteer faculty members. Staff training was accomplished in part by a pre-service workshop which produced sets of program and activity ideas which module leaders could combine in a variety of ways to produce appropriate learning experiences.

How is it going? Twenty students registered. The beginning has been like all hesitant first steps, but there appears to be great satisfaction. As suggested above, the evaluation problem is causing some difficulties. For example, a few students are obviously using the relative lack of structure as an excuse to do very little. This also happens in faculty-run courses, where the solution also probably lies in the selection of students for these courses. The best assessment might be: It is running, and with sufficient early signs of success to warrant continuation. The general lessons for student-run courses which it has so far given are that such enterprises are not incompatible with existing structure, that unless there is some specific reason for avoiding this "legitimacy," student-initiated alternatives to current educational practice do have the opportunity of being accepted, and finally, that seeking responsibility for effecting change--not merely asking colleges to do it for students--might be an important element of this process.

Topic: Interdisciplinary Studies

Presenter: Dan Anderson, Goddard College
 John Addelson, Cathy Grove, and John Katz,
 College Within, Tufts University
 Joe Miliensky, Worcester Polytechnic

"Interdisciplinary Studies is a means, not an end." This was the predominant theme of all discussion in the workshop. Interdisciplinary Studies was discussed in the light of its ability to facilitate and broaden the learning experiences of students.

It was shown how many themes can be looked at through a variety of disciplines. For this reason it was agreed that an interdisciplinary view is a more complete view, and is invaluable in the understanding of certain topics. Ecological research, for instance, is not and cannot be limited to a strictly technological approach. Obviously, there are social, economic, educational, and political aspects to be considered. The representative from Worcester Polytechnic Institute stated that a unidisciplinary approach could hinder the attempts of students to turn their acquired knowledge into general awareness, and consequently prevent action on, or valid use of the learning process. He added that an interdisciplinary education is essential in developing the personal awareness of students, and pointed out that, in general, the interdisciplinary endeavor teaches majors and honors students in specific disciplines the limits of their particular fields of knowledge.

Such Interdisciplinary Studies Programmes will also be of extreme importance in closing the ever-widening gap in education, as well as in society as a whole, between technological, humanitarian, and social interests. As a consequence, progress in any of these three areas will be facilitated and made more valid by coordination with the other areas.

Many in the workshop were concerned with the implementation and administration of an Interdisciplinary Studies Programme at Loyola. Representatives from Tufts and Worcester attested to the fact that such an educational device would require a more fluid structure than presently exists in most university departments. They stressed the possibilities of students being stifled in a limited structure. It was felt that any one department could not meet the varied needs of students studying under such a programme. Joe Mielinsky from Worcester stated that a loose structure created for the interdisciplinary studies programme was needed to "plug into" certain departmental facilities without having to be absorbed by the departments.

The seminar ended with the observation that an additional and informal structure was needed for effective implementation of a programme concerned with interdisciplinary studies.

Topic: Living and Learning

Presenters: Judi Cape, Anne Dragemark,
Taylor Grant and Paul Ranger,
Students, John Abbott College (CEGEP)

This experiment in Living and Learning consists of fifteen students who live together in a house on campus. They are all involved in an independent study project. They receive one credit for living together. This is to justify its worth in the academic aspect. All students must keep a diary of their day-to-day interaction.

Certain criteria have to be met: (1) Each student must pay \$100 per year and work 65 hours per year on campus. (2) They must accept the clinical psychiatrist (guidance counselor) who attends their Tuesday and Thursday meetings. In these meetings, business aspects, e.g., food money of \$6.00 per week, new furniture, etc., and problem-solving involved in human interaction are discussed. (3) The students must also evaluate the purpose for their presence on campus.

Most of the students are in Arts, although a few are in Nursing or Science. Besides the one credit received for the experiment on alternatives to education, the students take the other five credits regularly on campus.

The students benefit immensely from this type of situation. They learn to cope with other human beings. They learn how to deal with in depth relations. They learn by exchanging their own knowledge with that of 14 others. Of course, because of the closeness developed, problems do arise. These everyday arguments (who left the milk out? and so on) can be solved easily enough. The purpose of the weekly meetings is to iron out these little difficulties. The problem of forming cliques must also be dealt with. These few difficulties, however, do not outweigh the advantage of having this project on campus.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON

Topic: Cooperative Education

Presenters: Paul Dubé, Northeastern University
Ed O'Reilly, Mohawk College
Arnold Lind, Waterloo University

Northeastern University in Boston has been the pioneer in cooperative education. Their program dates back to 1909. The large majority of their 13,800 day students are on the Coop plan. This involves full-time study during the freshman year, followed by four years of alternating between work and study. To facilitate this kind of movement, the year is organized in quarters. In any one year, the student can spend from three to nine months at work, and the rest at study, or vice versa. Over four years, each student will have had two full years of study, and two full years of work. Each class of students is divided into student pairs; while one student (and half the class) is at work the other is at study, and when a student leaves the job he is replaced by another student, thus guaranteeing the employer continuity.

The benefits for the employer are considerable: motivated young employees, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, with good chances of recruiting graduates who know what the real work situation is about.

However, the emphasis of the program is on the educational benefits to the students. In addition to the financial benefits, the cooperative plan offers students the opportunity to extend their studies into practical application situations. It develops the social aspects of their professional preparation, and helps immensely in career planning. Coop works as well in the Liberal Arts as in the Sciences and Technologies, though the job opportunities may be less directly related to the academic discipline.

Two important aspects of the Coop are the extensive counselling services involved, and the very serious evaluation of the work experience which both the student and the employer undertake.

Mr. O'Reilly and Mr. Lind responded to questions about how the Coop scheme works out in Canada. They pointed out

that some professional associations and unions were inclined to try to restrict Coop's recruitment of job opportunities, but did not judge this to be a major stumbling block. As for the various Canada Manpower program, there have been no experiences of conflicts or duplication, and in some cases, Manpower has even fed suitable employment opportunities to the Coop people.

Our Coop guests gave us the impression of being sincerely interested, and seriously engaged in providing students the framework in which to link their studies dynamically with the actual working world.

Topic: Independent Studies

Presenter: Douglas Crawford, University of Toronto,
David Christman and John Kinsel,
New College, Hofstra University

During the workshop, most of the discussion centred around methods of insuring the success of an Independent Studies Programme. A heavy emphasis was placed upon the role of the student in such a programme.

It was shown that it is necessary, in terms of fair evaluation, for the student to give a clear definition of his or her objectives at the outset. The student could then be evaluated as to whether or not these objectives were realized. Mention was also made of the need for an "on-going evaluation" of the project, the means of evaluation to be stated clearly by the student in the application for independent study. This factor, plus confidential communication between the student and his advisor, would prevent the student from straying away from his/her objective.

It was suggested that there must be institutional support for initiation of the program to ensure constant progress. It is of major importance that such a program remain flexible in order to meet the changing needs of the students. The students must play a major role in maintaining and developing high standards. It is the student who is, and should be, the strongest creative force in education innovation.

For an independent studies program, a structure is needed that will protect and encourage both further innovation, and the role of the student in such innovation.

(Note: This seminar operated together with the following one on Alternative Structures, to form a large and wideranging discussion group. The above notes were separated from the total discussion to reflect the topic considered.)

Topic: Alternative Educational Structures--
Institutional Initiatives

Presenters: George Geis, Charles Pascal, and
Bruce Shore, Centre for Learning and
Development, McGill University

The main purpose of this discussion group was to review some of the types of support and initiative that can be provided by institutions of higher education for innovations, particularly teaching and learning innovations.

One of the first points made was the need for institutions to recognize through accepted rewards--promotion, tenure, discretionary salary increases, formal recognition--the contributions of faculty members to the teaching role of the university. There are often lip-service to rewards for teaching, but it rarely attracts the attention of research, publications, or service. It did not take long for the question of evaluation of the quality of teaching to come up. The discussion on this point did not become technical, but one specific suggestion made was that as with the evaluation of students, the multiple purposes of evaluation should not be confused. An evaluation intended to help professors improve their teaching should not also be used for making salary and similar decisions. One of the consequences of universities not providing adequate rewards for teaching activities might be the frequently observed professor who approaches his research, writing, or other creative personal work with a rigor and dedication that can gain him a world wide reputation among his peers, who on the other hand, takes a very casual approach to the preparation of learning experiences for students. The fault is not all theirs.

Institutions have other alternatives. The most commonly observed at this conference is the setting up of special innovative units, either as direct teaching units or centres employing animators who assist innovation elsewhere.

There are any number of routes to implementing innovation. At one extreme, new programmes can be started outside normal academic activities with voluntary non-credit participation

by staff and students. If the idea works, it might be taken over by the institution and eventually made an integral part of it. At the other extreme, a whole campus may be thrust into a particular experiment. More common, and probably more desirable, are alternatives undertaken by parts of the institution.

A general observation offered was that it might well be the fate of all innovations to become institutionalized, somewhat depleted of their uniqueness. The task of the innovator, especially the innovator in a large institution, might be first and foremost to think of alternatives, to get them underway, and then to move on to another idea, not becoming too involved in the maintenance of any one program. In this way, the greatest possible number of alternatives can be provided, and the institution can become accustomed to innovative initiatives as an ongoing process rather than regard them as a daring renewal at irregular intervals. A major responsibility of innovators is also likely the education of institutional administrators, particularly with regard to their seeking to innovate for the right reasons. Myths of reduced costs and the appeal of enhanced public image should not be allowed to get in the way of making universities better places to teach and learn.

(Note: This seminar operated together with the preceding one on Independent Studies, to form a large and wideranging discussion group. The above notes were separated from the total discussion to reflect the topic considered.)

CLOSING SESSION

The closing session of the conference saw reports from the workshops on Cooperative Education and Independent Study Programs. Closing speeches were given by Mr. Max Beck, the National Director of Opportunities for Youth, and Mr. William Tetley, Quebec Minister of Financial Institutions.

The workshop reports, delivered by Mr. Paul Dubé (North-eastern University) on Coop, and Dr. Douglas Crawford (University of Toronto) on Independent Study, were very similar in content. Both stressed the viability of their programs, as alternatives to traditional methods of instruction. Great stress was placed on the necessity of implementing these programs at a small level, and to increase the size of the programs according to their development. In relation to Loyola, these programs seemed to be alternatives to the type of education presently offered. In the implementation of such programs, it is necessary to emphasize, as the conference participants did, the need for a means of continuous evaluation to be built in the program. This will provide the overview needed to ensure adaptability to change.

Mr. Beck spoke on education within a broad framework citing examples across Canada. Statistics were given, which showed that in 1971, our government spent 7.2 million dollars on the education of foreign students, while spending only \$300,000 on Indian students in Universities. He criticized the elementary and high school systems provided for Indian and Eskimo students, which have a low percentage of students progressing past high school. This is in line with a general increase across Canada in the number of students dropping out of schools.

Education is continuing to be unable to fulfill its role as a social equalizer. Students from low income groups are represented disproportionately on a per capita basis. Education, in a society with a creed of social ascendancy, is designated as the catalyst for this social mobility. Canada's educational institutions are inaccessible to the people who need them most.

When questioned about the educational potential of Opportunities for Youth, Mr. Beck stated: "This is not possible due to the impermanence of the projects run by Opportunities for Youth (projects have a maximum duration of eighteen weeks)."

In response to a question on the functional qualities of OFY, Mr. Beck replied, "OFY has received a great deal of criticism since its inception. Much of this criticism is due to the fact that we go into a community to develop a project which provides jobs for students, and then when the summer is over we leave without worrying about the community we have invaded. However the problem cannot be solved unless we receive further funding, so that we can continue those projects which prove beneficial to the communities OFY enters."

Mr. Tetley gave the final address. He represented the provincial government, when it was apparent that Education Minister Cloutier, despite a month and a half of correspondence, would not attend.

Mr. Tetley, not being an educator, spoke on general problems in education and about the relation between finances and education. He observed that "we cannot expect to have the same quality of Education as Ontario, because quite simply we don't have as much money as Ontario." When questioned on how he justified having the 76 Olympics in Montreal in lieu of his previous statement, and the financial problems created by Expo 67, Mr. Tetley expressed the feeling that there was no justification for having the Olympics, and he would just as soon see it elsewhere. He was also challenged from the audience with regard to the implication that Quebec's higher education system must be necessarily inferior to Ontario's for financial reasons. The argument offered was that the absolute size of Quebec's university system is quite large enough to encourage and support excellence, and that monetary differences at this level of comparison should not be used as an excuse to be satisfied with less.

The question of finances and education is a critical one in Quebec today. Quebec's policy in the past few years has been boom and then bust. This has been the result of artificial stimulants to the economy (like Expo 67) and the recession periods that sometimes follow.

The final statement by the Minister was that the government was wrong not to have accepted the invitation to be represented at this meeting, and that he would take back with him the invitation of the organizers to confront them on educational issues they consider important.

EDUCATION CONFERENCE IN RETROSPECT

"New Directions in Education" was the theme of the conference, and while we did explore new directions, I have come to the realization that they are new only in terms of Loyola. Other institutions have been utilizing such programs as Independent Study, Inter-Disciplinary Studies and Cooperative Education for a number of years, and with good success.

The sense of direction which the conference has given me is that we must stop examining innovation and start implementing. We have passed the groping exploratory stage, and what is now needed is a support structure for Loyola's innovators, within which they can begin the implementation of new programs.

Such a structure has been proposed as a part of the motion on Interdisciplinary Studies now before Loyola's Senate. It calls for the creation of an Experimental Studies Unit as a centre for innovation. However, not all new programmes should be confined to the Unit.

Contrary to the belief held by many at Loyola, that Independent Study can be offered as a type of reading course, we must allow for the creative, and independent exploration of subject matter within all courses. Innovation is not a delimiting proposition. Its purpose is to provide alternative structures for the University as a whole, and not just within specific courses.

Still other programs may only be implemented on a small scale within such a Unit, both for organizational purposes, and as a safeguard in use of failure.

If we are to continue to exist as a dynamic institution, which can (because of its moderate size) provide viable alternatives to the Massive Education Factories, we must avoid stagnation. To talk more of innovation would be stagnating. It is time to make a commitment to specific projects.

Eric Novick

CONFERENCE EXECUTIVE

Coordinator: Eric Novick

Chairman: Bruce M. Shore

Loyola of Montreal Students Association Executive:

Co-President: Barry Sheehey

Co-President: Peter Fedele

Educational Vice-President: Alain Godbout

Communications Vice-President: Mark Tigh

External Vice-President: Don Boisvert

Internal Vice-President: Claude Veullet

Special Services Vice-President: Victor Alinauskas

Campus Centre Vice-President: Joe Supino

Public Relations Vice-President: Lillian Stanimir

Financial Vice-President: Peter Tobin

Financial Adviser: Desmond Clarke

LIST OF INVITED GUESTS
AND SPEAKERS

Mr. Jon Addelson
Graduate Student Mentor
College Within
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155
U.S.A.

Mr. Dan Anderson
Member, Educational Council
Goddard College
Plainfield, Vermont
U.S.A.

Dr. Joe Burke
Academic Vice-President
Loyola of Montreal
7141 Sherbrooke West
Montreal 262, Quebec

Miss Judi Cape, Student
Living and Learning
John Abbott College (CEGEP)
P.O. Box 2000
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec

M. Claude Charron, MNA
Hôtel du Gouvernement
Québec 4e, Québec

Prof. David Christman
Dean, New College
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York
U.S.A.

Dr. Douglas Crawford
College of Education
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Miss Anne Dragemark, Student
Living and Learning
John Abbott College (CEGEP)
P.O. Box 2000
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec

Prof. Paul E. Dubé
Director of Consulting Services
Center for Cooperative Education
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts
U.S.A.

Prof. Reginald Edwards
Department of Educational Psychology
McGill University
3700 McTavish Street
Montreal 112, Quebec

Dr. George L. Geis
Centre for Learning and
Development
McGill University
P.O. Box 6070
Montreal 101, Quebec

Mr. Taylor Grant, Student
Living and Learning
John Abbott College (CEGEP)
P.O. Box 2000
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec

Mr. Gerry Gross
 Director, CEGEP Division
 Loyola of Montreal
 7141 Sherbrooke West
 Montreal 262, Quebec

Miss Cathy Grove
 Graduate Student Mentor
 College Within
 Tufts University
 Medford, Massachusetts 02155
 U.S.A.

Mr. Michael Harris, Coordinator
 MOSAIC
 Dawson College (CEGEP)
 350 Selby Street
 Westmount
 Montreal 215, Quebec

Mr. John Katz
 Graduate Student Mentor
 College Within
 Tufts University
 Medford, Massachusetts 02155
 U.S.A.

Dr. John Kinsel
 Assistant Dean, New College
 Hofstra University
 Hempstead, New York
 U.S.A.

Prof. Henri Lau
 Department of Philosophy
 Loyola of Montreal
 7141 Sherbrooke West
 Montreal 262, Quebec

Mr. Arnold Lind
 Montreal Area Consultant
 (Engineering)
 Waterloo University
 Waterloo, Ontario

Mr. Joe J. Milienski
 Projects Administrator
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute
 Worcester, Massachusetts
 U.S.A.

Mr. Ed O'Reilly
 Director (Communication Arts)
 Cooperative Education Program
 Mohawk College of Applied Arts
 and Technology
 Hamilton, Ontario

Dr. Charles E. Pascal
 Centre for Learning and
 Development
 McGill University
 P.O. Box 6070
 Montreal 101, Quebec

Mr. Paul Ranger, Student
 Living and Learning
 John Abbott College (CEGEP)
 P.O. Box 2000
 Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec

Prof. Peter Russel
 Principal, Innis College
 University of Toronto
 Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Bruce M. Shore
 Centre for Learning and
 Development
 McGill University
 P.O. Box 6070
 Montreal 101, Quebec

Copies of this Report are available at \$0.50 per copy,
postpaid, from the Loyola of Montreal Students Association,
6931 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal 262, Quebec, Canada.